DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 952 95 EA 007 693

TITLE	Curriculum Planning and Evaluation. The Best of ERIC Series, Number 14.
INSTITUTION	Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 75
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080353-3514
NOTE	5p.
AVAILABLE FROM	ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403 (free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Annotated Bibliographies; Community Involvement; Curriculum; Curriculum Design; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Curriculum Planning; Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education

ABSTRACT

The 14 documents and articles in this annotated bibliography include discussions that attempt to define or delimit what curriculum planning and evaluation are as well as discussions that address more specific aspects of the topic, such as the board of education role in the curriculum, decentralization's effect on the curriculum, participative decision-making on curriculum matters, and the community's role in the curriculum. (IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED114952

The Best of ERIC

Clearinghouse on Educational Management

Number 14 December 1975

The Best of ERIC presents annotations of ERIC literature on important topics in educational management.

The selections are intended to give the practicing educator easy access to the most significant and useful information available from ERIC. Because of space limitations, the items listed should be viewed as representative, rather than exhaustive, of literature meeting those criteria.

Materials were selected for inclusion from the ERIC catalogs *Resources in Education (RIE)* and *Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE)*.

This bibliography was prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management for distribution by the Association of California School Administrators.

Curriculum Planning and Evaluation

Alkin, Marvin C. "Evaluating 'Curriculum' and 'Instruction'." ***Curriculum Theory Network***, 4, 1 (1973-74), pp. 43-51. EJ 097 886.

The poor definition of subject is "a major cause of many of the difficulties of evaluation," according to Alkin. Evaluators frequently fail to distinguish among curriculum, instructional planning, and instructional operation, even though these three terms refer to distinct, though related, concepts.

Alkin defines ***curriculum*** as "the results or ***ends*** of an instructional activity." ***Instruction*** consists of the means to achieve the curriculum goals. Planned instruction and that which is actually carried out are not synonymous, though they are sometimes confused by evaluators.

To define the distinctions among these components, Alkin proposes the use of a matrix illustrating their interrelationship and the various levels at which their evaluation may take place. He emphasizes that no rigid line can be drawn between "macro" and "micro" levels because of the complexity of curriculum and instruction programs. But use of the matrix will at least allow for more specific analysis. For example, if a nationwide program is to be evaluated, the focus will be on the macro level (what curriculum and instruction consist of for ***all*** schools involved, not just for a random sample).

Alkin's attention to precision is commendable, and his criticism of the unspecific nature of some curriculum and instruction evaluation is regrettably accurate.

Babin, Patrick. "Slaughtering Some Sacred Cows." ***Education Canada***, 14, 1 (March 1974), pp. 40-45. EJ 097 353.

The eight "sacred cows" that Babin advocates eliminating are "myths that must be eliminated if any real progress is to be made in curriculum planning and development."

First, Babin questions the notion that the department of education should prescribe curriculum, stating that "individual teachers and students (and their parents)" can develop curriculum more relevant to the students' needs. He points out that the term ***curriculum*** is defined differently by different educators and that a definition incorporating process as well as content should be formulated.

Although the individual teacher should be given more time to plan curriculum, he or she cannot be held solely responsible for its development, as some educators assume. Babin advocates expanded inservice training for curriculum planning. He also questions the rigidity of "behavior by objectives," pointing out that teachers often find such an approach hard to implement. The often-perceived gap between "theory" and "practice" should be closed, according to Babin; theory is absolutely essential in order to generate workable curriculum. And finally, he advocates a revision and expansion of curriculum evaluation methods.

Babin's arguments are clearly stated, and his article makes easy and interesting reading.

Brokes, A. L., and Jenks, C. L. ***Planning for Program Implementation—A Process Guide. Instructional Planning Series.*** San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1975. 123 pages. ED 102 741.

Since much important curriculum planning is done in the individual school, it is essential for building principals, curriculum directors, and teachers to become involved in this process in a constructive manner. The purpose of this guide is to provide schools with the means to solve instructional problems encountered in programs already in operation. Brokes and Jenks maintain that their process guide will be more valuable if it is directly applicable to "a real program."

This guide emphasizes the dynamics of group planning. The planning group, including "persons who have responsibility for an instructional problem or who are motivated toward a solution," is meant to encourage motivation and confidence on the part of all staff members involved in instructional implementation.

The "Planning for Program Implementation Unit" specifies three basic functions to be carried out by the planning group. First, the purposes of the program must be determined. Then the instructional programs intended to implement these purposes must be planned. And finally, the eventual analysis and evaluation of the program must be outlined.

This guide is interesting because it attempts to render the theory of planning into concrete, workable terms.

Order from EDRS. MF $0.76 HC $5.70. Specify ED number.

EA 007 693

Cawelti, Gordon. "How to Get Your Hands on Your District's Curriculum." *The American School Board Journal*, 161, 5 (May 1974), pp. 36-40. EJ 096 071.

In this three-part article, Cawelti outlines the history of curriculum theory, lists issue areas that school boards should consider when developing curriculum, and sketches the process whereby boards can play an active role in curriculum planning.

Three major developments in curriculum theory—progressivism, curriculum reform, and innovation—have affected current thinking. Since the rise of the progressive education movement in the 1930s, the number of American students graduating from high school has increased steadily, as has the average per-pupil expenditure. Cawelti points out that many of the ideas considered radical four decades ago are now accepted components of curriculum theory.

He suggests some areas in which curriculum development seems to be expanding, and he advises school boards to take these concerns into consideration when making curriculum decisions. They include career education, the use of technology in instruction, and overcoming bias in instructional materials.

The school board should be deeply involved in curriculum goal setting, planning, and evaluation, according to Cawelti.

Deming, Basil S., and Phillips, James A., Jr. "Systematic Curriculum Evaluation: A Means and Methodology." *Theory Into Practice*, 13, 1 (February 1974), pp. 41-45. EJ 095 544.

"Evaluation has remained of uneven quality in the area of school curriculum," according to Deming and Phillips. Curriculum evaluation has not "attained the state of development and refinement characteristic of experimental research."

In their attempt to overcome some of the disadvantages of evaluation methods, these researchers have developed an evaluation model intended to accomplish two major goals. First, the model is intended to allow for "far more definitive judgments" than previous constructs. And it is meant to accommodate more stringent testing so that its users can easily apply it to their particular purposes.

The model emphasizes description, internal consistency analysis, and the analysis of program components through the use of external judgment criteria. By measuring the relationships among the philosophic assumptions, program intents, process, product, and external judgment criteria, the model specifies the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum.

These researchers applied their model to "an actual educational program" at Kent State University and indicate satisfaction with its performance.

Fredericks, Stephen J. "Curriculum and Decentralization: The New York City Public School System." *Urban Education*, 9, 3 (October 1974), pp. 247-256. EJ 108 474.

What happens to curriculum evaluation, change, and development when a large school system undergoes decentralization? Fredericks examined 30 school districts in New York City to discover if these local districts and the citizens they serve had acquired more control over curriculum matters after the city system was decentralized. He found that decentralization of curriculum evaluation and planning processes was far from successful.

Because the individual districts lack the curriculum specialists and the resources to assist in planning and evaluation, these districts continue to rely in part on the already established curriculum generated by the central board of education's curriculum experts. Fredericks found that "generally the curriculum was not evaluated at all," though some districts tended to the other extreme, having conducted three or more evaluations. This group had instigated curriculum changes since 1969, unlike the districts that had not evaluated curriculum.

In all the districts, the school boards and their superintendents were identified as playing a "major role" in curriculum development. However, community leaders, parents, students, and individual schools played very little part in curriculum planning. Fredericks states that "in terms of grass-roots participation, the data indicate that decentralization is proceeding very slowly."

Garber, John B. "2 x 4 x 6 x 9 = ? What Is the Role of the Community in the Curriculum?" *Community Education Journal*, 4, 3 (May-June 1974), pp. 27-29. EJ 096 090.

Although the philosophy of community education allows for participation by noneducators in curriculum planning, in practice community members (specifically, members of community advisory councils) rarely have any voice in curriculum determination, according to Garber.

Traditionally, curriculum development and planning have been relegated to the professional educators and those in positions of authority within state education departments and local school districts. The current thrust for community involvement in all areas of education is counter to the established curriculum process. As Garber points out, school administrators and boards of education are especially reluctant to involve laymen in this process. This reluctance "is largely due to unwillingness to take the risk of sharing power."

However, the community can be a valuable resource for curriculum planning, Garber maintains. He suggests that it will take time for a workable relationship to evolve between professional curriculum planners and laymen.

Klein, M. Frances; Tye, Kenneth A.; and Goodlad, John I. "Perspectives of Curriculum." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association annual meeting, Washington, D.C., April 1975. 35 pages. ED 103 959.

Curriculum planning is not necessarily "a rational and deliberate process," according to this proposal. Part of the difficulty in curriculum planning, as well as in implementation, lies in the complexity of "curriculum" itself. As these authors point out, defining what is meant by "the curriculum" is not

HOW TO ORDER ERIC REPORTS

Copies of journal articles (identified by EJ numbers) are not available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or from the Clearinghouse. Copies of ERIC documents (identified by ED numbers) may be ordered from EDRS in either microfiche (MF) or hard copy (HC). Do not order documents from this Clearinghouse unless so specified. When copies may be obtained from other sources, ordering information is given in the individual entry.

When ordering from EDRS, please include the ED numbers of documents requested. All orders must be in writing, and payment must accompany orders of less than $10.

Postage must be added to the cost of all orders. Weights for determining the amount of postage are as follows: 96 pages = 1 microfiche, 35 microfiche = 1 pound, and 100 hard copy pages = 1 pound. Book rate costs $0.20 for first pound, $0.09 per additional ½ pound or part thereof. First class or air mail postage is available at additional cost.

Address requests to EDRS, Computer Microfilm International Corporation, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210.

as simple as it seems. As they state, "Perhaps there is no such thing as 'the' curriculum, but the curriculum studied depends upon who or what factor or set of elements is used as a data base."

To assist in this definition process, these authors propose five "significant perceptions" of the curriculum, each contingent on a different data base. The five varieties are the ideal, the formal, the perceived, the operational, and the experiential. A comparison of these five types of curriculum will, according to the authors, reveal areas of correspondence and discrepancy among the perceptions of students, teachers, administrators, and curriculum developers.

The authors propose to include data collected from their curriculum substudy in a much more extensive "Study of Schooling, U.S.A.," which will incorporate data from many areas in education.

Order from EDRS. MF $0.76 HC $1.95. Specify ED number.

Knoop, Robert, and O'Reilly, Robert. *Participative Decision Making in Curriculum.* [1975]. 10 pages. ED 102 684.

Teachers' perceptions of how curriculum decisions are made are compared with their preferences for how such decisions should be made in this study of 192 secondary teachers. The respondents were allowed to choose between two general kinds of "decisional procedures"—"one-man" procedures in which the principal, department head, or individual teacher makes the curriculum decisions, and group procedures. The teachers matched these procedures with three curriculum-related tasks—textbook selection, planning curriculum for a subject, and evaluating a subject curriculum.

As Knoop and O'Reilly state, "The most obvious result is the low level of perceived and desired involvement of the principal as sole decision maker." Also, the findings show that teachers would prefer the department chairman play a "sharply decreased" role in decision-making. And whereas teachers indicated a preference for selecting their own texts, they desired less involvement as single decision-makers in curriculum planning and evaluation, preferring more democratic group approaches.

These data correspond in part with Myers' model for decision-making in curriculum, according to Knoop and O'Reilly, especially as far as the principal's role is concerned.

Order from EDRS. MF $0.76 HC $1.58. Specify ED number.

Schwab, Joseph J. "The Practical 3: Translation into Curriculum." *School Review*, 81, 4 (August 1973), pp. 501-522. EJ 083 816.

To most efficiently plan curriculum, Schwab recommends that five areas of "experience" be represented in the process. These areas of expertise, taken together, serve to create a balanced, effective curriculum. The five "bodies of experience" involve expertise in subject matter (the "scholarly" aspects of curriculum) and acquaintance with the students, with their social and cultural milieus, with the teachers, and with the process of "curriculum making" itself (how to balance sometimes conflicting factors).

This latter skill is especially important, according to Schwab, since the art of curriculum planning is infrequently based on coordinated, overall educational concerns. As he states, "The practical problem arises from the fact that a group of men is rarely commissioned or financed to think about *education.*" The result is a fragmentation of the planning process—an overemphasis on one of the five areas listed above.

Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. *School Curriculum Design for the 1980's. The Possibilities for Tomorrow's School: A Proposed Program for the 1980's.* Austin, Texas. 1974. 238 pages. ED 098 660.

This curriculum model, intended to carry out "Goals for Public School Education," is a good example of the kind of general curriculum guidelines for school districts set out by state education departments. Although this document contains suggested components for specific kinds of educational programs, such as early childhood education, occupational and technical education, and migrant education, the specifics of these programs are not spelled out.

The model does specify four basic curricula that should be present in a "comprehensive school program": problem-focused curriculum, curriculum for humanistic values, curriculum for specialization, and curriculum for personal growth and development. Correlated with these basic curricula are four "conceptual overlays" (valuing, individualization, and multicultural and career education) that influence "what is taught, when it is taught, and how it is taught."

This document, intended for direct use by individual school districts, includes bibliographic information.

Order copies from Dr. Dwane Russell, Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Box 6111, S. F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches, Texas 75961. $4.00.
Also available from EDRS. MF $0.76 HC $12.05. Specify ED number.

Wise, Robert I. "The Use of Objectives in Curriculum Planning: A Critique of Planning by Objectives." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association annual meeting, Washington, D.C., April 1975. 19 pages. ED 103 956.

The assumption that identifying ends will automatically lead to the formulation of better means is the basic one underlying planning by objectives. However, according to Wise, the nature of this "conception of planning" is not as logical as many think. The difficulties lie in identifying (or creating) the instructional means to carry out the planned curricular objectives, and in the overlapping relationship between means and ends.

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the National Institute of Education. ERIC serves educators by disseminating research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of several such units in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in Resources in Education (RIE), available in many libraries and by subscription for $42.70 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Journal articles are announced in Current Index to Journals in Education. CIJE is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $50 a year from CCM Information Corporation, 866 Third Avenue, Room 1126, New York, New York 10022.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, monographs, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its educational area.

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Association of California School Administrators for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Association of California School Administrators or the National Institute of Education.

EA 007 883

Wise points out that the specification of education objectives does eliminate certain instructional means, but does not identify what means could be effectively used. As he states, "the information in an objective is not sufficient to deduce a learning activity which will achieve the objective."

Another problem with planning by objectives is that it demands an absolute separation between means and ends. But Wise points out that especially in curriculum, "there are no such things as absolute means or absolute ends." Teaching a child to write a coherent paragraph is an end (and can be stated as an objective), but it is also a means to teaching him to write a coherent paper.

Wise does not condemn the use of planning by objectives in curriculum development, but he does urge awareness of its weaknesses.

Order from EDRS. MF $0.76 HC $1.58. Specify ED number.

Worner, Roger. "Ten Questions to Pry Apart Your District's Curriculum." *The American School Board Journal*, 161, 6 (June 1974), pp. 22-24. EJ 097 858.

Worner offers pointers intended to define and give direction to a school district's curriculum. Noting that "the curriculum is never static," he emphasizes the need for constant reevaluation and ongoing planning, as well as effective communication with not only the curriculum implementers, but with the public as well.

Program objectives should be clearly stated in written form and should be made available to anyone who wishes to review them. The "foundation skills" to be taught in each program and at each level should be presented in the same manner.

In order to most efficiently allocate district funds to worthwhile programs, a budget accounting system, such as a Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS), should be utilized. Cost-effectiveness analysis should be employed to identify alternatives to present instructional programs.

Worner points out that annual reassessment of curriculum, in conjunction with curriculum study and design, is necessary to maintain cohesion in the instructional program. Long-range management planning is also essential, and this process should include provision for taking into account the opinions of the public on curriculum.

This article is refreshingly concise and easy to read, although it is not intended to be an indepth examination of curriculum and instructional planning.

Wilhelms, Fred. *What Should the Schools Teach? Fastback Series, No. 13.* Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1972. 41 pages. ED number not yet assigned.

"The blunt fact is that we have accumulated a lot of junk," Wilhelms says of curriculum. In this clearly written paper, he points out that "there is little scientific evidence to go by" in this area. He calls for the application of "comon sense" in determining what the schools are to teach.

The more traditional goals of curriculum and instruction, such as teaching the use of language and effective communication, are important, and Wilhelms believes that the three Rs should be taught. But the four major purposes of curriculum that he outlines supersede the traditional "fundamentals." According to this author, curriculum should offer career education, teach students how to live with "the great technology," develop "effective citizenship," and promote personal fulfillment.

Although granting the importance of the other three purposes, Wilhelms devotes more attention to career education, which he defines much more broadly than vocational education. Career education involves the process of building up the self-confidence of the students as well as acquainting them with a wide spectrum of career opportunities. And it involves fundamental consumer education, intended to teach students how to function efficiently in a complex economic world.

Order copies from Phi Delta Kappa, Eighth and Union, Box 789, Bloomington, Indiana 47401. $0.50 single copy, $3.00 set of six, $18.00 complete set of sixty-six, quantity discounts, payment must accompany orders of less than $5.00.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403